



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/605,555	10/08/2003	Anthony A. Sconzo	225308292003	2554
26496	7590	07/17/2006	EXAMINER	
			MAI, TRI M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3727	

DATE MAILED: 07/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/605,555	Applicant(s) SCONZO, ANTHONY A.
	Examiner Tri M. Mai	Art Unit 3727

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the retracting mechanism, the shoulder strap being adjustable in length, the operation of the lock in claim 10, must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

2. The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609.04(a) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless

the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

3. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The specification fails to describe the retracting mechanism and its operation, and the operation of the shoulder straps with respect to its adjustability. Furthermore, specification fails to describe the first and second securing means adequately. The claim recites the second securing mechanism is portion 140. However, Fig. 6 does not show the second securing mechanism is disposed at the mid area of the backpack.

4. Claims 1-8, and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tugan in view of Lettieri (3477410). Tugan teaches a backpack, a tether device. Tugan meets all claimed limitations except for the retracting mechanism in communication with the device and a wrist loop. Lettieri teaches that it is known in the art to provide a retractable mechanism, and a loop. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the table mechanism, and a loop as taught by Lettieri to enable one to retract the tether easily.

Regarding claim 2, note the locking mechanism 28.

Regarding claims 11-15, note the second securing mechanism 62.

5. Claims 8-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Tugan rejection, as set forth above, and further in view of Ivarson et al. (6474524). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide adjustable shoulder straps and first securing mechanism to provide added security. It is noted that portion 42 can also be the second securing mechanism as claimed.

6. Claims 8-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Tugan rejection as set forth above in paragraph 3, and further in view of Golling et al. (5873506). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a mechanism fastens the shoulder straps together as taught by Golling to provide an alternative shoulder strap arrangement. It is noted that portion 11 can also be the second securing mechanism as claimed, and it disposed at the mid area of the backpack as claimed.

7. Claims 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Tugan rejection as set forth above in paragraph 3, and further in view of Adams (2577670), It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide an identification window as taught by Adams for security/identification purposes.

With respect to the location of the identification window, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to dispose the identification window on the outside top portion, since it is well known art to rearrange parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art, see In Re Japikse, 86 USPQ 70 (CCPA) 1950.

8. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. With respect to the drawing objection, it is noted that 37 CFR 1.83(a) requires that the drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Thus, the retracting mechanism, the shoulder strap being adjustable in length, the operation of the lock in claim 10, must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim. With respect to the 112, 1st paragraph rejection, due to the

failure to provide adequate and understandable drawings, as set forth in the drawing objections, the 112, 1st paragraph rejection is maintained. 112, 1st paragraph requires that the claims contains subject matter which to be described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed. However, the drawings did not satisfy this requirement and the rejection is maintained.

Other arguments are moot in view of the new grounds of rejections as set forth above.

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tri M. Mai whose telephone number is (571)272-4541. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Newhouse can be reached on (571)272-4544. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Tri M. Mai
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3727

